

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,638	01/04/2007	Hideo Ohno	293408US2X PCT	8527
23850 7590 02/17/2012 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.IP. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			HAN, JONATHAN	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2818	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/17/2012	FLECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/585,638	OHNO ET AL.
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 28 December 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
I Note: I rice 22 betention: Off Tracts of the Charles and the State (as a filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies; (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date	of the final rejection.				
b)  The period for reply expires on. (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: (1b or 1s is checked, check either box (a) or (b) ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPURS FILED WITHIN TO					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.138(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee bunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a set forth in (6) above, if checked, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL					
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complianc filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since				
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better for	orm for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for				
appeal; and/or  (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).					
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
7. ☑ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER					
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  With respect to arguments made in regards to claim 1, Applicant has argued that Sakakima does not describe that the resistance element includes only magnetic materials, However, Examiner notes that such a rectation does not exist within the claims, but					
merely that there are magnetic bodies. The magnetic body internal structure does not require them to be made of pure magnetic material and can be composed of ther materials as well as long as the final structure is magnetic. Even if the non-magnetic film between the hard and soft magnetic films reduces the force of the coupling, there is still a magnetic force and therefore can be considered magnetic. In regards to arguments made in regards to the current flow, Nickle discloses direct current flow to move					
the magnetic lavers as opposed to Sakakimas's exposure to the magnetic field of the current passing through Sakakima. Nickel and Sakakima disclose alternative methods to producing the same result of moving the magnetic lavers and Nickel clearly discloses in Column 4, lines 49-59, the current flows predominantly through the magnetoresistant layer through the first and second layer.					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
	/DAVID VU/				
	Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2818				
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				

Application No. Part of Paper No. 20120210